REMARKS

The Examiner's action and the references newly cited therein have been carefully considered and the application has been amended accordingly. Claims 1 and 8 have been rewritten to now recite that the license is acquired by the conditional access component and the selected conditional access system is enabled by the conditional access component after successful verification of the license by the conditional access component. It is believed that the claims presently on file are allowable over the newly cited art and, for the reasons which follow, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw all grounds of rejection over prior art.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8 and 10 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Giachetti et al in view of Schooneveld, the Examiner stating that Giachetti et al teaches all of the features recited in the rejected claims except that it "fails to disclose the license authorization in more detail." Schooneveld is cited to show licensing authorization methods, such as transmission of EMMs, ECMs, etc. This ground of rejection is respectfully traversed for the reasons set forth hereinafter.

The present invention provides a conditional access component that includes several software items, each referred to as a conditional access system and each being directed to a particular access system. An important feature of the present invention is to preload several conditional access systems in a single conditional access component before the component is provided to the end user, whereby the user, upon acquiring a license for a particular provider's content, can selectively enable that provider's conditional access system in the conditional access component. In this manner only a single device is required for an end-user to consume services from several conditional access systems as contrasted, for example, with prior practice wherein each provider's conditional access system was linked to its own hardware. In accordance with the present invention, several conditional access systems are preloaded in the single conditional access component prior to the component being provided to the end user, but are disabled, and do not become activated until the end-user elects to activate any particular system by paying or agreeing to pay the necessary license fee and acquiring the required license. Claim 1 recites that (1) a plurality of particular conditional access systems are loaded onto (2) a single conditional access component at the same time that the generic system is loaded onto the component and (3) the particular conditional access

systems are initially disabled, (4) the preloaded component is provided to an end-user, (5) a smart card comprising a conditional access identification is inserted into the component for identifying a particular preloaded conditional access system to be used by the conditional access component based on the conditional access identification, (6) a license is acquired by the conditional access component for the identified conditional access system, (7) the license is loaded into the component and (8) the identified conditional access system is enabled by the conditional access component after successful verification of the license by the conditional access component.

Claim 8 recites a conditional access component having a first software module embedding a basic functionality common to a plurality of different conditional access systems, said module allowing a particular identified conditional access system to be enabled subject to successful verification of a license therefor, a plurality of preloaded specific application software of which each constitutes a particular conditional access system in conjunction with the basic functionally, a non-volatile memory for storing the plurality of specific application software, the particular conditional access systems being initially disabled in the non-volatile memory, a smart card inserted into said component, means on said smart card for identifying a particular conditional access system, means in said conditional access component for acquiring a license for the particular identified preloaded conditional access system, and means in the conditional access component for selectively enabling the particular preloaded identified conditional access system subject to a successful verification of the corresponding license by the conditional access component.

The elements of claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8 and 10 are not rendered obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art based upon the teachings of Giachetti et al. in view of Schooneveld. Specifically Giachetti et al is directed to the use of a standardized interface between a decoder and one or more separate detachable CA modules. According to Giachetti et al, the separate detachable CA modules descramble the whole data so that the decoder is not used for descrambling at all and the same decoder is suitable for all CA systems. However, Giachetti et al fails to disclose a single preloaded conditional access component that contains **initially** all variations of the future functionalities, wherein the preloaded systems are disabled until a purchase action, such as acquiring a license, is performed and wherein means are provided in said conditional access component for selectively enabling at least one of the preloaded systems subject to successful verification of the license by said component. Rather

Giachetti et al teaches that each CA system should be loaded onto its own detachable CA component and does not teach that the CA systems are initially disabled. In addition, Giachetti et al does not address the feature of acquiring by the conditional access component of a license related to the identified particular preloaded CA system on the single CA component, loading the license into the CA component and enabling the particular preloaded conditional access system after successful verification of the license. According to the present invention, the acquisition and processing of the license is an internal function of the conditional access component. The license is requested, the license authorization message is received, loaded and processed by the conditional access component and the selected CA software is enabled by the conditional access component. This is contrary to Giachetti et al and to the normal processing of messages by the smart card in which the result of the processing, namely the control word, is returned to the receiver. In the instant method, the smart card is not running, except for basic functions such as reading the conditional access identifier, until the selected conditional access software is enabled. Once the conditional access identifier is read by the smart card, the conditional access module takes over, as indicated above, to request, acquire and process the license and to enable the software of the selected conditional access system.

Schooneveld at cited pages 218-219 teaches only the mode of operation of a conventional broadcast pay TV system. Like Giachetti et al it fails to disclose a single preloaded conditional access component that contains **initially** all variations of the future functionalities, wherein the preloaded systems are disabled until a purchase action. It is cited by the Examiner to disclose the license authorization method in detail. In fact, Schooneveld does teach conventional descrambler authorization via the use of smart cards which may contain fixed program authorizations valid for a certain period of time or smart cards to which subscriber authorizations are transmitted via EMMs, together with the scrambled television signal, and which store the authorizations after decryption. However, this is merely teaching the well known use of smart cards to carry subscriber authorizations, obtain authorization to issue the special key and, once authorized, to pass this special key to the decoder. Schooneveld does not teach and does not suggest to one skilled in the art the unique claimed method of the present invention whereby the conditional access module, not the smart card, performs all of the functions required to request, acquire and process the license and to enable the software of the selected conditional access system. Accordingly,

Schooneveld is no more relevant than Giachetti et al with respect to addressing the claimed features of acquiring by the conditional access component of a license related to the identified particular preloaded CA system on the single CA component, loading the license into the CA component and enabling via the CA component the particular preloaded conditional access system after successful verification of the license by the CA component.

The rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8 and 10 under 35 USC 103(a) fails because Giachetti et al does not disclose preloading software access systems onto a single conditional access component, which systems are disabled when installed, and which may be selectively enabled by the end user by acquiring a license, which is verified by the system. Accordingly, Giachetti et al fails to disclose essential elements of the rejected claims. Further, Schooneveld, which is cited specifically to disclose the license authorization, discloses only conventional license authorization via the smart card and does not teach or suggest the claimed features of performing, via the conditional access component and not via the smart card, all of the functions required to request, acquire and process the license and to enable the software of the selected conditional access system. Accordingly, no combination of Giachetti et al and Schooneveld, as suggested by the Examiner, would render the subject matter of rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8 and 10 obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8 and 10 as unpatentable over Giachetti et al in view of Schooneveld should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Specifically, with respect to claim 8, on the penultimate line of page 6 of the office action, applicant assumes that the reference to Rabne is an inadvertent typographical error since Rabne is not cited as a part of the 35 USC 103(a) ground of rejection. It is believed that the Examiner actually intended to refer to Giachetti et al. If this is not the case, the Examiner is requested to clarify both the ground of rejection and the reference to Rabne.

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Giachetti et al in view of Schooneveld and further in view of Kamperman et al. Kamperman is cited to show a conditional access component including a filter unit for filtering out specific EMMs of conditonal access systems. Even assuming arguendo that Kamperman contains such disclosure, this limited disclosure of Kamperman does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Giachetti et al in view of Schooneveld. Specifically, Kamperman et al does not disclose preloading a plurality of conditional access systems onto a single conditional access component, which systems are disabled when installed, and which may be selectively

enabled by the conditional access component by requesting, acquiring and processing a license and enabling the software of the selected conditional access system. Accordingly, no combination of Giachetti et al in view of Schooneveld and further in view of Kamperman et al can be seen to render unpatentable these inventive aspects of the present invention. Accordingly, remaining claim 3 is allowable at least because it depends from allowable claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal of all of the prior art grounds for rejection is respectfully urged and an early Notice of Allowance directed to remaining claims 1-5, 8 and 10 is courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____

Stuart J. Friedman
Registration No. 24,312

28930 Ridge Road
Mt. Airy, MD 21771
Telephone: (301) 829-1003